

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-24 are pending. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the remarks set forth herein.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (U.S. 6,999,637). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Arguments Regarding Independent Claims 1, 7, and 13

The Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 sets forth a novel combination of features not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner, including Anderson et al. and Matsumoto et al.

Independent claims 1, 7, and 13 as currently written sets forth a combination of features, including *inter alia*

“...(reading means for) reading the image data sets and the accompanying information added thereto from the recording medium; and (composition means for) generating composite image data representing the composite image based on the accompanying information by inserting the respective images represented by the image data

MSW/CTT/lps

sets in image insertion areas of a template having the image insertion areas corresponding to the accompanying information”.

The Examiner asserts that Anderson et al. (column 4, line 48 to column 22) disclose the structure of the present invention as set forth in claims 1, 7, and 13. However, the accompanying information disclosed in Anderson et al. is merely information including an indication of which images are desired to be placed in a template. In other words, according to Anderson et al., the accompanying information added to the image is used to decide whether or not the image is to be placed in the template.

On the other hand, with the present invention as set forth in claims 1, 7, and 13, the accompanying information added to the image is used to place the image in the insertion area corresponding to the accompanying information. Anderson et al. do not teach this feature of the invention.

At least for the reasons described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features set forth in each of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Anderson et al. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. 6,229,566). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner pointed out that Matsumoto et al. disclose the structure of the present invention defined in claims 5, 11 and 17. However, the storage unit 104 disclosed in Matsumoto et al. merely stores an image and the information when the image is captured.

On the other hand, according to the present invention defined in claims 5, 11 and 17, the storage means stores recommended composition data sets at various photographing locations by relating photographing information, including location information representing the photographic location, to the recommended composition data sets. Further, Matsumoto et al. do not disclose reading desired recommended composition data based on the photographing information, or displaying the recommended composition image in superposition in the image obtained by the photographing means, as set forth in each of dependent claims 5, 11 and 17.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to its dependency from an allowable independent claim, as well as for the additional novel limitations set forth therein.

All claims of the present invention are now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated:

SEP 15 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant



MSW/CTT/lps